MOTION FILED
APR 18 1979

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

No. 78- 1430

PRETERM, Inc., et al.,

Petitioners

vs.

EDWARD M. KING, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al.

Respondents

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

---

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF WITH BRIEF AS AMICUS CURIAE FOR THE LEGAL DEFENSE FUND FOR UNBORN CHILDREN IN SUPPORT OF THE RESPONDENTS

ALAN ERNEST
5713 Harwich Ct. #232
Alexandria, Va 22311
Counsel for Amicus

INDEX

Motion for leave to file amicus brief . . i

Brief by amicus curiae 1

Summary of Argument 1

Argument 2

PART I: Roe v Wade Is Based On False Evidence 2

PART II: The Court's Procedures Are Unconstitutional 6

PART III: The Case Against The Supreme Court 9

Conclusion 12

AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Baxter v Palmigiano, 47 L Ed 2d 810(1976) . . 12

Marbury v Madison, 1 Cranch 137(1802) . . 11, 13

State v Moore, 25 Iowa 128(1868) 5

Texts:

Archbold, J.F., Archbold's Criminal Procedure, Pleading and Evidence(6th ed 1853). 5

Denman, T., M.D.: An Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery (1802) 4

Hodge, H.L., M.D.: The Principles and Practice of Obstetrics (1864) 4

Transactions of the American Medical Assn. . 5

Velpeau, A.L.M., M.D.: A Complete Treatise on Midwifery(4th American ed. 1852) . . . 4

Wharton, F., and Stille, M., M.D.: A Treatise on Medical Jurisprudence(1860) . . . 5

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE ON BEHALF OF THE LEGAL DEFENSE FUND FOR UNBORN CHILDREN IN SUPPORT OF THE RESPONDENT

The Legal Defense Fund For Unborn Children is an organization whose interest is to protect the constitutional rights of unborn children.

The amicus presents legal matter to the Court which is not presented by the parties.

The amicus tenders evidence to show that Roe v Wade, 410 US 113 (1973) is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been unconstitutionally exterminated. Of course, this requires the overruling of that case.

If Roe v Wade were overruled, it would be dispositive of this case.

The amicus also adopts by reference the new evidence presented in the brief in support of the Motion To Appoint Counsel For Children Unborn And Born Alive. That evidence shows many Roe v Wade killings to be murder in the first degree.

WHEREFORE, the Court is moved to grant this motion for leave to file this amicus brief.

Alan Ernest
Counsel for Amicus

BRIEF

For the 33rd time, the Supreme Court is petitioned to overrule Roe v Wade, 410 US 113(1973) on the grounds that it is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been unconstitutionally exterminated.

Can it be pretended that it is any longer the government of the United States,- any government of Constitution and laws,- wherein a Tribunal holding office for life, and asserting to be the ultimate arbiter, conducts proceedings to condemn millions of victims to death; fabricates evidence to make the exterminations appear legal; refuses to allow its evidence to be cross-examined; refuses to appoint counsel to defend the victims; refuses to allow evidence to be presented on behalf of the victims, even evidence showing that the victims are being unconstitutionally exterminated by false evidence?

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

1. The Supreme Court is petitioned to overrule Roe v Wade, 410 US 113(1973) on the grounds that it is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been unconstitutionally exterminated. See PART I, infra pages 2-6.

2. It is also alleged that, independent of the evidence in Roe v Wade, the procedures used by the Supreme Court to effect the Roe v Wade killings so palpably violate due process of law as to leave no question that the exterminations are unconstitutional. See PART II, infra pages 6-9.

3. It is further alleged that the Roe v Wade killings violate federal criminal statutes. The Supreme Court of the United States is charged with criminal falsehood and criminal extermination. See PART III, infra pages 9-11.

ARGUMENT

PART I

ROE v WADE IS BASED ON FALSE EVIDENCE

It is alleged that Roe v Wade, 410 US 113(1973) is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been unconstitutionally exterminated: Roe v Wade must be overruled. An EXHIBIT A, outlined below, has been repeatedly submitted to the Court to prove this charge.

EXHIBIT A was succinctly outlined in counsel's 16th petition to overrule Roe v Wade (Unborn Child Roe v John J. Sirica, Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, (78)A-215):

"1. even the Supreme Court admitted in Roe v. Wade that if the unborn were 'a "person" within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment' then the case for abortion for convenience 'of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life is then guaranteed specifically by the Amendment,' and

"2. the express, universal terms of the Fourteenth Amendment ('nor shall any State deprive any person of life . . . without due process of law') on their face, protect the lives of the unborn, as everyone else, and

"3. the holdings of Chief Justice John Marshall (that can be traced through the Constitution, The Federalist Papers, and The Federal Convention of 1787) show that the Supreme Court had no lawful authority to construe an exception to express, universal terms (such as 'any person') unless the Court could prove the exception to the express, universal terms beyond a reasonable doubt, and show that 'had this particular case been suggested' to the framers the 'language would have been so varied, as to exclude it,' and

"4. the Supreme Court presented false evidence to support its conclusion in Roe v Wade that 'the word "person," as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn,' and but for the false evidence, there is not even a credible foundation, much less a compelling one, for denying the protection of the express, universal terms 'any person' to the lives of the unborn, and

---

Summary of False Evidence

In introduction, at the time the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, most states had already enacted positive statutes that made abortion a crime unless it were necessary to save the life of the mother. Within a few years, these criminal abortion statutes were virtually universal.

Consequently, any theory of a constitutional right to abortion on demand faced an impossible contradiction: How is it possible that the people who adopted the Fourteenth Amendment had enacted positive criminal statutes to protect unborn life, and at the same time, without a single word of explanation, intended to imply an exception to the express, universal terms that not "any person" can be deprived of life without due process of law, and to create a constitutional right to abortion on demand?

To resolve that fatal contradiction, the Court asserted the hypothesis that when the criminal abortion laws were first enacted, the laws were not intended to protect unborn life, but rather were only intended to protect the mother. This hypothesis was falsely fabricated and used as follows:

(A.) The Supreme Court first asserted, "When most criminal abortion laws were first enacted, the procedure was a hazardous one for the woman." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 174. This was asserted as fact.

The only authority cited by the Supreme Court to prove this assertion of fact was a 20th century medical history book, Haagensen and Lloyd, A Hundred

Years of Medicine 19(1943). But this book merely described the hazards of major surgery in general prior to Lister's discovery of antiseptics. The reference did not even mention the abortion operation.

However, the 19th century obstetric authorities throughout the Western World prove the Court's assertion of fact to be false. These 19th century obstetric authorities, based on their own experience in performing abortions, and from hundreds of cases reported from around the world, declared in their obstetric textbooks that the abortion operation, the operation of artificially evacuating the fetus from the womb, was "perfectly safe" to the mother, 2 T. Denman, M.D., An Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery 96(1802)(English physician); or "experience has proved that the dangers of the operation are reduced to a small matter," A.L.M. Velpeau, M.D., A Complete Treatise on Midwifery 530(4th American ed. 1852)(French physician); or "to the mother there is very little danger." H.L. Hodge, M.D., The Principles and Practice of Obstetrics 293(1864)(American physician). In short, the obstetric authorities prove the Supreme Court's assertion of fact to be false.

The Supreme Court never revealed the "hazardous" abortion "procedure" to which it was referring. Actually, the 19th century physicians used the ancient method: "the membranes of the ovum are punctured," which permitted "the discharge of the waters," which induced the "action of the uterus" to "come on," which resulted in the expulsion of the fetus from the womb. 2 Denman, supra, 99. One 19th century physician traced this operation back almost 2000 years.

(B.) The Supreme Court next asserted, "Abortion mortality was high." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 174. This is asserted as fact.

The Supreme Court asserted "Abortion mortality was high" without any authority to support it. It is a naked assertion. The 19th century obstetric authorities also prove this assertion of fact to be false.

(C.) Upon the two false assertions of fact, the Supreme Court infers that "a State's real concern in enacting a criminal abortion law was to protect the pregnant woman, that is, to restrain her from submitting to a procedure that placed her life in serious jeopardy." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 174.

(D.) From the inference that the criminal abortion laws were not intended to protect the unborn, the Court further inferred that, likewise, the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment did not intend it to protect the lives of the unborn, "that the word 'person,' as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 180. This conclusion rests entirely on inference.

This pyramid of inference is shown to rest on assertions of fact that are false.

Moreover, as independent corroboration of the purpose of the criminal abortion statutes to protect the unborn, 19th century authorities in criminal law, e.g., 2 Archbold, Archbold's Criminal Procedure, Pleading and Evidence 295(6th ed 1853); medical jurisprudence, e.g., F. Wharton and M. Stille, M.D., A Treatise on Medical Jurisprudence 339, 927(2d ed. 1860); medicine, e.g., 13 Transactions of the American Medical Association 56-58 (1860); as well as state supreme courts, e.g., State v Moore, 25 Iowa 128, 135-136(1868), did expressly affirm that these criminal abortion statutes were intended to protect the lives of the unborn.

Consequently, not only is the Supreme Court's inference about the purpose of the 19th century abortion laws shown to rest on false assertions of fact, but there is no other evidence to come to the rescue and save the Court's conclusion. The 19th century authorities prove the very contrary.

In Summary, the Supreme Court bore the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the express, universal terms of the Fourteenth Amendment,

"any person," did not include the unborn. Yet, the Supreme Court did not cite one 19th century authority that expressly affirmed that the unborn were not persons within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment, or that there was a constitutional right to abortion on demand; and the Court's conclusion that the 19th century abortion laws were not intended to protect the unborn is shown to rest on false evidence. To the contrary, the 19th century authorities demonstrate that the people who adopted the Fourteenth Amendment not only intended to protect the lives of the unborn, but had already enacted criminal abortion statutes to do so in fact.

"5. the truthful history corroborates that the express, universal terms 'any person' include the unborn, as they do all categories of persons, and more certainly than many groups. The Supreme Court included corporations and aliens as a 'person' within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment merely on the strength of the express, universal terms 'any person,' without any independent corroborating evidence whatsoever. (The unborn being the only persons ever excluded from the terms 'any person')

"In short, EXHIBIT A shows that the Supreme Court violated the very letter of the Constitution as well as its spirit, and condemned millions of victims to death whom the Constitution endeavors to preserve. . . . . (A)nd there appears to be no defense that will not amount to a claim that the Supreme Court is above the law."

PART II
THE COURT'S PROCEDURES ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Completely independent of the Court's evidence, supra PART I, it is also alleged that the procedures used by the Supreme Court to effect the Roe v Wade killings are in such manifest conflict with due

process of law as to leave no doubt that the killings are unconstitutional.

As counsel's 17th petition to overrule Roe v Wade pointed out (Gaetano v. Earl Silbert, United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, No.78-427):

"The evidence in Roe v Wade aside, the procedures used to effect the Roe v Wade killings alone condemn the killings as illegal. The Nuremberg court, in outlining the case against the Nazi judicial system, noted that many victims were executed after trials which 'did not approach even a semblance of fair trial':

'In many instances they were denied the right to introduce evidence, to be confronted by witnesses against them. . . . They were ... denied the right of counsel of their own choice, and occasionally denied the aid of any counsel.' [citation omitted]

" The U.S. Supreme Court has, in broad form, used these very procedures to effect the Roe v Wade killings. For example, in Roe v Wade, the Court used evidence found by itself, which the parties had not cross examined in a judicial proceeding. The Attorney General of Georgia, a party, requested leave to cross examine the Supreme Court's evidence:

'The Court has taken judicial notice of innumerable facts . . . some which are unknown to the parties but which apparently were extricated from various sources by the Court's diligent research, which facts nevertheless should be subject to refutation and counter evidence since they form the foundation of the Court's opinion.' Petition for Rehearing at 4, Doe v Bolton, 35 L Ed 2d 201(1973).

"But the Supreme Court would not allow its evidence to be cross examined by the party. Pet. Rehearing denied, Doe v Bolton, 35 L Ed 2d 694(1973).

"And year after year, the Supreme Court has denied these applications to present evidence on behalf of the unborn victims to show that the unborn are persons whose lives are protected by the U.S. Constitution. This new evidence shows the Supreme Court's evidence to be false; and the Supreme Court will not allow the evidence to be presented.

[For example, in Planned Parenthood of Central Missouri v Danforth, 49 L Ed 2d 788(1976)(the first major abortion case after Roe v Wade) eight lawyers, as counsel or amici, submitted an amicus curiae brief, outlining the evidence in PART I, supra, and alleging that "newly discovered evidence indicates that Roe v Wade rests upon factual errors that require the overruling of that case."

Since the purpose of amicus briefs is to present legal matter to the Court, not presented by the parties, so that the Court will not go wrong on vital national affairs, the Court seldom rejects amicus briefs. Stern and Gressman, Supreme Court Practice 481-82(4th ed 1969). The landmark constitutional decision which applied the Fourth Amendment exclusionary rule to the States was predicated upon argument by amicus curiae, not the parties. Mapp v Ohio, 367 US 643, 646 n.3(1961). And in the Missouri abortion case it was only the amicus brief that presented the newly discovered evidence showing Roe v Wade to be based on false evidence.

But the Supreme Court would not allow this amicus brief to be filed. Motion to file by D.C. Right to Life Committee, et al., denied 46 L Ed 2d 633(1976). After refusing to allow this "newly discovered evidence," showing Roe v Wade to be based on false evidence, to be presented on behalf of the unborn, the Court proceeded to nullify parts of the Missouri abortion statute, and effectively extended the killings in the name of Roe v Wade.]

"And no abortion case before the Court appears to have had counsel to especially represent the unborn and defend their constitutional right to life.

[Moreover, the Supreme Court has repeatedly refused

to allow counsel to represent the unborn in its judicial proceedings, and to defend the unborn's constitutionally protected right to life.

In Doe v Bolton, the Attorney General of Georgia requested the Court to allow "representation of a guardian ad litem for that fetal entity and for its right to develop to birth." Petition for Rehearing supra, at 5. But the Court denied the request.

In Beal v Franklin, No. 77-891, the Court heard argument after refusing to allow counsel to represent the unborn and present the evidence, supra PART I, to show that the victims were being unconstitutionally exterminated by false evidence. 57LEd 2d 1131.

In Anders v Floyd, No. 77-1255, the Supreme Court again refused to allow counsel to defend the unborn and present the evidence, supra PART I.]

"In summary, without counsel representing the victims, it appears that the Supreme Court itself produced evidence to condemn the victims; denied permission to cross examine its evidence; and denied requests to present evidence on behalf of the victims, even evidence showing the Court's evidence to be false. Exterminations pursuant to these procedures cannot be pretended to be lawful."

PART III
THE CASE AGAINST THE SUPREME COURT

Counsel's 8th (Gaetano v Louis Oberdorfer, Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, No. 77- 1358) and each subsequent petition, specified the federal criminal statutes believed violated, and charged the Supreme Court with criminal falsehood and criminal extermination.

The Supreme Court has not denied the charges, much less attempted to prove the charges to be false:

"THE CASE AGAINST THE SUPREME COURT

"The evidence appears to support the charge that some Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have violated federal criminal statutes, such as:

"18 USC 242, Deprivation of rights under color of law,- It is a crime for government officials, acting under pretense of law, to willfully deprive persons of their rights secured by the U.S. Constitution. The documentation in EXHIBIT A, at the very least, permits reasonable people to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that the unborn are persons whose lives are protected by the U.S. Constitution. The evidence that Justices specifically authorized killings throughout the United States, by a willfully false construction of the Constitution, would certainly permit a jury to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices, acting under pretense of law, had deprived millions of unborn persons of their right to life protected by the U.S. Constitution.

"22 D.C. Code 201, D.C. abortion statute,- The felony abortion statute only permits abortions in the District of Columbia to preserve the mother's life or health. The evidence that Justices specifically authorized non-therapeutic abortions in violation of the positive criminal statute, by a willfully false construction of the Constitution, would surely permit a jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices had aided and abetted those killings.

"22 D.C. Code 105 a, Conspiracy,- When Roe v Wade was decided, non-therapeutic abortions were illegal, not just in the District of Columbia, but generally throughout the United States. The evidence that Justices specifically authorized non-therapeutic abortions in violation of the States' positive criminal statutes, by a willfully false construction of the Constitution, would appear to permit a jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices conspired to effect those killings.

"18 USC 1503, Obstruction of justice,- It is a

crime to endeavor to obstruct or impede the due enforcement of the law of the land, even by conduct that is otherwise legal, if the motive is corrupt or dishonest. The evidence that the Supreme Court has been petitioned year after year to overrule Roe v Wade on the grounds that it is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been illegally exterminated, and year after year the Supreme Court summarily refused to even listen, would appear sufficient to permit a jury to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices had dishonestly endeavored to obstruct or impede the due enforcement of the law of the land.

"18 USC 1001, False statements,- The evidence that some Justices, within their official jurisdiction, made or adopted false statements in Roe v Wade, and repeated petitions indicated the false statements to be willful and knowing, might be sufficient to permit a jury to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that some Justices had made false statements within 18 USC 1001.

"18 USC 371, Conspiracy,- It is not only a crime to conspire to commit any criminal offense, but also to conspire to defraud the United States by misrepresentation or the overreaching of those charged with the carrying out of the governmental intention. The evidence already mentioned would appear sufficient to permit a jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices had not only conspired to commit the above mentioned crimes, but also to defraud the United States.

"18 USC 1621, Perjury,- An oath of office to uphold the Constitution would probably not, under ordinary circumstances, support a charge of perjury. However, Chief Justice John Marshall held that for "judges" to "swear" to discharge their duties "agreeably to the constitution" and then "close their eyes on the constitution" and "condemn to death those victims whom the constitution endeavours to preserve" is worse than "solemn mockery," it is a "crime." Marbury v Madison, 1 Cranch at 179-180.

And failure to deny a charge can be taken as an admission that the charge is true. "Underlying the rule is the assumption that human nature prompts an innocent man to deny false accusations and consequently a failure to deny a particular accusation tends to prove belief in the truth of the accusation." McCormick On Evidence 353(1972). "(T)he Court has consistently recognized that . . . silence in the face of accusation is a relevant fact . . . . . Silence is often evidence of the most persuasive character." Baxter v Palmigiano, 47 L Ed 2d 810,822 (1976). And Socrates cross-examined at his trial over 2000 years ago, "(Y)ou are silent, and have nothing to say. But is this not rather disgraceful, and a very considerable proof of what I was saying"? And again,"I may assume that your silence gives consent." Apolpgy in Plato 41,45(Jowett transl. 1942).

CONCLUSION

Can it be pretended that it is any longer the government of the United States,- any government of Constitution and laws? As noted in the 18th petition to overrule Roe v Wade(Gaetano v U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 78-428):

"Through Roe v Wade, the Supreme Court has asserted a second method for the government to condemn persons to death:

"The first, set out in the Constitution, is by conviction by an impartial jury for violation of express laws enacted by the people and applicable to all in the state; with right to representation by counsel; with right to be acquitted unless found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; with provision to stop execution if new evidence is discovered.

"The second, set out in Roe v Wade, is for a Tribunal holding office for life(without assistance of counsel to defend the victims)to rule the victims out of the human race as inferiors, in violation of the very letter and spirit of the Constitution, falsifying evidence to make the homicides appear legal, and year after year to repeatedly deny applications showing the exterminations to be illegal.

"In 1975, the Supreme Court of West Germany held that the clause in the German Constitution, 'Everybody has the right to life,' also 'includes unborn human beings,' that 'Abortion is an act of homicide,' and the state has a 'duty' under the Constitution 'to protect unborn life.' . . .It was just about 35 years ago that the German judges decided that certain persons were not protected by their law. And it is now of paramount international importance to determine how it is possible for the high courts of two major democratic nations, construing constitutional phrases that are substantially identical, to reach diametrically opposing conclusions about the legality of millions of premeditated homicides.

"That examination, presented in EXHIBIT A, surely permits reasonable people to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that the Supreme Court closed its eyes on the Constitution and condemned to death millions of victims whom the Constitution endeavors to preserve; and there appears to be no defense that will not amount to a claim that the Supreme Court is above the law- that as Hitler was to Germany, so the Supreme Court is to America.

"If it be true, as Chief Justice Marshall once held(see Marbury v Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 163, 176, 178) that 'government of laws, and not of men,' founded in a 'written constitution' deriving its just power from the 'supreme' 'authority' of 'the people' is 'the greatest improvement on political institutions,' then the overthrow of that government of laws by lawless federal judges may be the most heinous crime in the history of government."

Wherefore, counsel demands opportunity to cross examine the evidence in Roe v Wade, and to present evidence on behalf of the unborn to establish their constitutionally protected right to life and that the Supreme Court obey the evidence.

Alan Ernest
Counsel